

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending prior to the present amendment.

Claim 1 has been amended.

Claims 6-17 have been canceled.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cartier.

Claims 11-17 are canceled and all rejections based thereon are moot.

Cartier is cited as disclosing a base with the motor, wheels, and universal joint attached to the base. In reaching such a conclusion the Office has been equated the rotating line trimmer to the base, which is consistent with the present disclosure, yet the wheels are attached to a separate base. Furthermore, the universal joint is between this separate base and the handle which manipulates the line trimmer.

In an effort to advance the application to allowance Applicant has specifically amended claim 1 to recite that the wheels are directly attached to the base. This is supported in the various figures and consistent with the disclosure. No new matter is entered by this amendment. Similarly, claim 11 has been amended to specifically recite that the wheels are directly attached to the base.

Cartier fails to teach a base with wheels directly attached to the base and therefore fails to anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from, and further limit claim 1. Cartier fails to anticipate claims 2 and 4 for, at least, the same reasons it fails to anticipate claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1, 2, and 4 and 11-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Cartier is improper due to the failure of Cartier to recite claimed elements. Removal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cartier in view of Savell.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cartier in view of Mizobata.

Claims 3 and 5 depend from claim 1 and Cartier is applied as in claim 1. The inapplicability of Cartier with regards to claim 1 is set forth previously.

Savell merely recites a lower grip and does not mitigate the deficiencies of Cartier to recite the claimed invention.

Mizobata merely recites an electric motor and does not mitigate the deficiencies of Cartier to recite the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are improper and removal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swisher et al. in view of Winslow.

Claims 6-9 are canceled and all rejections directed thereto are moot.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swisher and Winslow as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Mizobata et al.

Claim 10 is canceled and all rejections directed thereto are moot.

CONCLUSIONS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the present application. All claims are in condition for allowance and notice thereof is respectfully requested.



April 20, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph T. Guy, Ph.D.
Agent for Applicants
Registration Number 35,172
NEXSEN PRUET JACOBS & POLLARD, LLC
P.O. Box 10648
Greenville, SC 29603
Telephone: 864-370-2211
Facsimile: 864-282-1177

RECEIVED
MAY 6 - 2004
GROUP 3600